



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/751,410	12/29/2000	Mark Owen Homewood	00-BN-056 (STMI01-00056)	7823
30425	7590	11/01/2005	EXAMINER	
STMICROELECTRONICS, INC. MAIL STATION 2346 1310 ELECTRONICS DRIVE CARROLLTON, TX 75006			MEONSKE, TONIA L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2181	

DATE MAILED: 11/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/751,410	HOMEWOOD ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Tonia L. Meonske	2181	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 August 2005.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Emma et al., US Patent 4,991,080.
3. The rejections are respectfully maintained and incorporated by reference as set forth in the last office action, mailed on May 17, 2005.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 14-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Emma et al., US Patent 4,991,080, in view of Boettner et al., US Patent 4,777,589.

6. The rejections are respectfully maintained and incorporated by reference as set forth in the last office action, mailed on May 17, 2005.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed August 22, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

8. On pages 9-14, Applicant argues in essence:

"The main stream processor 701 computes the target addresses for some branch instructions. Therefore, the main stream processor 701 of Emma cannot possibly anticipate a "non-branching cluster" that is "incapable of performing branch address computations" as recited in claims 1 and 8."

However, Emma has taught a non-branching cluster that is incapable of performing branch address computations. In Emma, the branching cluster comprises elements 301 and 501. The non-branching cluster comprises elements 201, 401, 601, and 701. The branch history table, element 301, is a part of the branching cluster. The branch history table performs branch address computations, such as branch address history corrections/updates (column 5, line 57-column 6, line 22, column 7, lines 22-36, column 22, lines 55-58, column 23, line 63-column 24, line 16). The non-branching cluster does not include a branch history table, so the non-branching cluster is necessarily incapable of performing branch address computations, such as the branch address history corrections/updates that the branch history table computes in the branching cluster. So the non-branching cluster of Emma is in fact incapable of performing branch address computations. Therefore this argument is moot.

It is further noted that "branch address computations" is a very broad claim limitation. Any computation relating to a branch address would read on the limitation. If applicant would like specific limitations read into the claims, then Applicant should specifically claim those limitations.

9. On page 14, Applicant argues in essence:

"The Office Action does not rely on Boettner as disclosing, teaching, or suggesting a "non-branching cluster" that is "incapable of performing branch address computations" as recited in claim 14."

Applicant is correct in that the Office Action does not rely on Boettner as disclosing, teaching, or suggesting a “non-branching cluster” that is “incapable of performing branch address computations” as recited in claim 14.” The Office Action relies on Emma for having taught a non-branching cluster that is incapable of performing branch address computations. See the rejection for claim 14 in the prior Office Action and the argument above.

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).
11. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.
12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tonia L. Meonske whose telephone number is (571) 272-4170. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, with every other Friday off.

13. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici can be reached on (571) 272-4083. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

14. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

tlm



10/28/05

HENRY W. H. TSAI
PRIMARY EXAMINER